

Misbranding of the article in each shipment was alleged for the reason that it was a cottonseed meal containing less than an equivalent of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of ammonia, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent cottonseed meal. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On November 20, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7250. Misbranding of Pabst's Okay Specific. U. S. * * * v. 10 Dozen Bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10055. I. S. No. 15321-r. S. No. E-1318.)

On April 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 10 dozen bottles of Pabst's Okay Specific, consigned on March 1, 1919, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Pabst Chemical Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Maryland, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of volatile and fixed oils, plant extractives, including cubebs, balsam of copaiba and buchu, and 29.85 per cent by volume of alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the package, bottle label, wrapper, and circular accompanying the package bore certain statements, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, which were false and fraudulent in that they represented that the article was effective for the treatment, remedy, or cure of gonorrhoea, gleet, urethritis, and chronic mucous discharges, when, in truth and in fact, the article did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On June 11, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*